

humanitarian purposes to nation building. It was up to the Congress of the United States to withhold funding. That might be necessary again, in a very unsatisfactory way, to have the constitutional mandate that only the Congress can declare war, enforced through the congressional power of the appropriations process. It is most unsatisfactory to have a Presidential commitment and to have U.S. troops involved and then to have it terminated only by the withholding of funds.

So it is my hope, Mr. President, that President Clinton will not act unilaterally, as he did in Haiti, against the overwhelming sense of the Senate and sense of the House that there not be an invasion of Haiti. Fortunately, it was done without bloodshed. But this is a constitutional issue of the highest import. If the President wishes to exercise the use of force in Bosnia, he ought to follow the constitutional doctrine, the precedent of the gulf war, and he ought to come to Congress for authorization. Then, and only then, will there be an appropriate opportunity to debate the matter and for Congress to exercise its will under the Constitution.

On the state of the record, my view is that there ought not to be an American commitment of troops. But, certainly, that ought not to be done by the President unilaterally. The matter ought to come before the Congress, and it ought to be a congressional decision one way or another, under the constitutional provision that only the Congress has the authority to declare war.

I yield the floor.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3041

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask that I be added as a cosponsor of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to show my support for this amendment, which, of course, includes U.S. funding for the U.N. Population Fund, UNFPA, as it is known. President Clinton had to resume funding for the population fund 2 years ago after a 7-year suspension during the Reagan and Bush administrations. I did not ascribe to that. I did not agree with the fine Presidents of my own party on that issue—either the wonderful Ronald Reagan or my fine, loyal friend, George Bush.

Last year, the Congress appropriated \$40 million for the fund, and \$50 million was appropriated for 1995. This year, we are looking at funding levels of \$35 million.

I do understand that funding for all programs across the board needs to be reduced if we are to incur savings in this year's budget bill. However, I do not want to see population programs unfairly targeted for larger reductions than other foreign assistance programs.

The United States needs to keep its funding at an adequate level, or we will surely send exactly the wrong message to the rest of the developed nations across the world. Last year, the United States was seen as a world's leader of population and development assistance at the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo. I was a congressional delegate at the conference, as was my friend, Senator John KERRY. There were not a lot of colleagues eager or seeking to go to that particular conference. I came away very impressed with the leadership and direction displayed there by Vice President GORE, and the assistance given him by the now Under Secretary of State, former Senator, Tim Wirth in guiding the conference and its delegates in developing a "consensus document," on a broad range of short- and long-term recommendations concerning maternal and child health care, strengthening family planning programs, the promotion of educational opportunities for girls and women, and improving status and rights of women across the world.

We surely do not want to lose our moral leadership role and relinquish any momentum by abandoning or severely weakening our financial commitment to population and development assistance. The United States needs to continue its global efforts to achieve responsible and sustainable population levels, and to back that up with leadership with specific commitments to population planning activities.

In my mind, of all of the challenges facing this country—and there are surely plenty of them—and around the world—none compares to that of the increasing of the population growth of the world. All of our efforts to protect the environment, all the things we hear about what is going to happen, what will happen to this forest system, or this ecosystem, promoting economic development, jobs for those around the world, are compromised and severely injured by the staggering growth in the world's population.

I hope my colleagues realize, of course, that there are currently 5.7 billion people on the Earth. In 1950, when I was a freshman at the University of Wyoming—not that long ago, surely—there were 2.5 billion people on the face of the Earth. Mr. President, 2.5 billion people using the Earth's surface for sustenance and procreation in 1950. Today, 5.7 billion—double—more than double.

Since 1950 to today, the figure has doubled and it will double again if birth and death rates continue. The world's population will double again in 40 years. These are huge figures.

If you want to talk about food supply, want to talk about the environment, pollution, fish, timber, coal, resources, there is your figure. Nobody pays much attention to that because we allow this debate to slip over to abortion. It does not have anything to do with abortion or coercive practices.

That is why it is so important we show our support by funding this particular fund. It is supported entirely by voluntary contributions, not by the U.N. regular budget.

You do not have to get into this one because you hate the United Nations either. This is not about whether you like the United Nations or not. Many of us have great problems with the United Nations, and they have certainly failed in many endeavors, but this is not a "U.N. caper."

There were 88 donors to the fund in 1994, most of which were developing nations. Japan and the United States were the leading contributors to the fund with the Nordic countries not lagging far behind.

UNFPA assistance goes to support 150 countries and territories across the world. UNFPA total income in 1994 was \$265.3 million, and it provides about one-fourth of the world's population assistance to all developing countries.

I think it would be a real shame if the United States were to back away from its commitment to the world's largest source of multilateral assistance for population programs.

I want to reiterate again what has been said already about U.S. participation in this fund. The U.S. contribution would be subject to all the restrictions which have been in place for many years. These restrictions are in place to address concerns specifically about U.S. funds being spent in China. I hear those concerns.

Under current appropriations law, foreign aid funding is denied to any organization or program that "supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization" in any country. That is pretty clear. I agree with that.

Furthermore, current appropriations law ensures that none of the United States contribution to UNFPA may be used in China—none. Listen carefully: The United States is not funding any of the population activities in China.

Furthermore, the U.N. Population Fund does not fund abortions or support coercive activities in any country including China. The UNFPA assistance goes toward family planning services and maternal and child health care across the developing world.

Finally, no U.S. funds may be commingled with other UNFPA funds and numerous penalties exist in law for any violation of this requirement.

I also have deep and serious concerns about China's coerced abortion policy, but forcing the U.N. Population Fund to withdraw from China will not affect that policy one whit. In fact, without

the careful monitoring that the fund performs, conditions in China would get very much worse. That is an important consideration. The world and the United States cannot turn its back on what is currently going on in China. Remove the funding and that great door will close ever further. No one will be able to participate or to change those policies.

Finally, this amendment would strike the House Mexico City language that denies United States population assistance to groups that are involved in dialog with foreign governments about abortion policy or even distribute literature on preventing unsafe abortions. This House amendment would ultimately deny family planning activities overseas. Since the House language applies to nongovernment organizations [NGO's] it would cut off funds to the most effective and dedicated providers of services, groups that best understand the needs of the people in the country they serve.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment so that the United States might continue its leadership role in addressing the global population issues which are wholly significant in the range of other issues that we confront from day-to-day, because all of it comes back to the simple fact, how many footprints will fit on the face of the Earth?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, Senator NICKLES is going to speak for a few moments and then we are prepared to vote. It is my understanding that if the Leahy amendment is agreed to, that will be the last vote of the evening.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Senator LEAHY's amendment. I will read it for my colleagues' information:

*Provided*, That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

It sounds kind of reasonable, until you realize we do not have restrictions on governments dealing with the prohibition of abortion. So this language is meaningless. It has no restriction whatsoever. That means that we would be funding international family planning groups that use abortion as a method of family planning. A lot of us really do not want to do that. It is troublesome to think that international groups, some of which support abortion as a method of family planning, would be receiving tax dollars to be used in that fashion. Maybe this amendment is a nice attempt to cover that up, as a substitute for the House language. I just hope that our colleagues will not agree to it, for a lot of different reasons.

One, I do not think we want to fund international groups that promote or support or fund abortions. I do not think U.S. taxpayers' dollars should be used for that purpose. We have restrictions in this country. We have restrictions in this country that prohibit the use of taxpayers' dollars to be used to fund abortions, except in necessary cases—to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest. That is really what the House language is trying to do.

The House language reinstates the so-called Mexico City policy, and it goes back to 1984 through January 1993, which includes the Reagan and Bush era. It says we do not want to fund international groups that support or fund abortion. That was the policy of this country for that period of time.

The Clinton administration, through an Executive order in January 1993, reversed that policy. So now we have a policy, and Tim Wirth who served in this body has been actively promoting it, where we actually have been involved in encouraging countries to change their laws on abortion. I think 95 countries have significant restrictions in their laws against abortion.

I think using U.S. taxpayers' funds to be telling other countries to change their laws is very offensive. Certainly to be contributing to organizations that use part of their money or some of their moneys for abortions is also offensive.

Again, our stated policy in this country is we do not want to support abortion. We do not want taxpayers' moneys used to subsidize abortion unless it is necessary to save the life of mother or in cases of rape or incest. To be giving money to international organizations that either support or use abortions as a method of family planning or to try to change Government laws for abortion, in my opinion, is wrong.

I looked at the House language and it basically says that money will not be used for organizations, nongovernmental or multilateral organizations, until the organization certifies it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country except if the life of the mother were in danger if the fetus were carried to

term, or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

I think that is good language. I think that language mirrors the language that we have agreed to on this floor dealing with Labor-HHS, the so-called Hyde language. Why in the world would we be supporting and giving money to foreign organizations that do the opposite? I think that is a serious, serious mistake.

Also, I might mention this House language says that we do not want any money to be used to violate the laws of any foreign country concerning circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated or prohibited. We do not want U.S. taxpayers' dollars used to go into other countries to lobby, to encourage, to change laws that they may have dealing with abortion. Why in the world should we have the idea that we know best, and so we want to manipulate and make those laws basically more pro-abortion.

I want to touch for a second on the issue of the People's Republic of China. There had been restrictions under the Reagan and Bush eras that we did not give money to the UNFPA organization if they were giving money to the People's Republic of China, because they had a coercive abortion policy. The House language, likewise, says we would not give money to the U.N. family planning organization if they were still supporting the coercive policies or contributing to the policies in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. President, I remember when Mrs. Clinton addressed a large conference in Beijing earlier this year and she condemned forced abortion. Unfortunately, that happens to be the policy in the People's Republic of China today—a one-child policy, enforced by, in some cases, coercive abortion. That is unbelievable. It is also undeniable. Yet UNFPA has actually made supportive comments about some of the things that are going on in the PRC today concerning their family planning efforts.

It is reprehensible to think that we might be contributing to an organization that might be assisting in coercive abortion. That should not happen.

Mr. President, I look at the language that we have before the Senate in the so-called Leahy language. I do not find it acceptable. I find no restriction whatever on U.S. funds to international organizations, no restriction whatever. If it passes and if it became law, we will be giving money to international groups that use abortion as a method of family planning.

That is offensive to me as a taxpayer. It is offensive to me to think that the result of that is that U.S. tax dollars will be used in some way or another to subsidize the destruction of innocent, unborn human beings.

I look at the House language. The House language is basically reinstating the policy that we had from 1984 to January 1993. That policy saved

lives. Did it restrict use of family planning? No. Did family planning continue? Yes. Did family planning continue with funding from the United States? Yes.

Over 350 organizations signed up and said, "We will take your money and use it for family planning, but we will not use abortion as a method of family planning." That means organizations all across the world. It worked. Some people said they would not sign up, but they did.

So we had family planning efforts, but we had family planning efforts separate from abortion. That is what we are trying to do with this House language.

I urge our colleagues to reject the Leahy amendment and support the House language.

I might mention, also, I think that the House language, which passed overwhelmingly, passed by a vote of 232-187. My guess is that if we do not have language similar to that, we will not have a bill. We will be looking at the foreign operations bill in a continuing resolution, in all likelihood, throughout the year.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Leahy amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, very briefly, with all due respect to my friend from Oklahoma, his description of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment is not accurate.

Mr. President, we debated the basic aspects of the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment less than a month ago. Mr. President, 57 Senators voted against what is in the House position, voted against the position we seek to replace. Nothing has changed since then.

The Leahy-Kassebaum amendment simply says that private family planning organizations like the foreign organizations supported by the International Planned Parenthood Federation should not be restricted to require more subjective requirements, more restrictive than those applicable to Government.

In other words, it permits us to support private organizations, provided U.S. Government funds are not used, are not used for abortion activities as we made funds available for family planning to governments in countries where abortion is legal, as it is in this country, just as we give foreign aid to countries where abortion is legal, as it is in this country.

This bill contains the same explicit prohibition of funding for abortion that has been the law for years. Not one dime in this bill could be spent on abortion or anything related to abortion. The bill already contains a prohibition against using any United States funds in China.

The House amendment would, nevertheless, prohibit a U.S. contribution to the U.N. population fund. I think that would be foolhardy. The question is whether we should accept the House position so that the bill might go forward.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement of administration policy from OMB be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
*Washington, DC, October 31, 1995.*

Re H.R. 1868—Foreign operations, export financing and related programs appropriations bill, FY 1996 (Sponsors: Livingston, Louisiana; Callahan, Alabama).

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
[This statement has been coordinated by  
OMB with the concerned agencies]

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the item reported in disagreement by the conference on H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, FY 1996. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The conferees have reported in disagreement provisions related to population assistance to non-governmental organizations. This is an issue of the highest importance to the Administration.

The Administration opposes coercion in family planning practices, and no U.S. assistance is used to pay for abortion as a method of family planning. The House provision, however, would prohibit any assistance from being provided to entities that fund abortions or lobby for abortions with private funds, thus ending U.S. support for many qualified and experienced non-governmental organizations providing vital voluntary family planning information and services. The provision would also end U.S. support for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). This would sharply limit the availability of effective voluntary family planning programs abroad that are designed to reduce the incidence of unwanted pregnancy and thereby decrease the need for abortion. The Administration also has serious concerns about the constitutionality of the House provision. If the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President that he veto the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I read the last sentence: "If the House language were included in the bill presented to the President, the Secretary of State would recommend to the President he veto the bill."

I think, Mr. President, we have heard debate for and against the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment. I know Senators are concerned about their schedule, and I am happy to go forward with a vote.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would like to thank the chairman for his leadership in crafting this foreign operation conference report. In light of the budgetary restriction placed upon all of these projects, I think the chairman has done a skillful job of handling many divergent interests.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would also like to thank the Senator for his assistance in attempting to remedy funding difficulties we have experienced for International Narcotics Control. As the chairman knows, I am extremely concerned that funding for U.S. drug interdiction efforts has been drastically de-

clining since 1992. During this time we have witnessed a proportionate increase in the use of drugs in America. For example:

After a steep drop in monthly cocaine use between 1988 and 1991 from 2.9 to 1.3 million users, and a similar drop in overall drug use between 1991 and 1992, from 14.5 to 11.4 million users, numbers released earlier this year revealed that youth drug use increased in 1994, for all surveyed grades for crack, cocaine, heroin, LSD, non-LSD hallucinogens, inhalants, and marijuana.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, illegal drug use among the Nation's high school seniors has risen 44.6 percent in the last 2 years.

The resurgence of heroin in the United States borders on epidemic proportions. DEA Administrator Thomas Constantine recently noted that heroin is now available in more cities at lower prices and higher purities than ever before in our history. In addition, Administrator Constantine says: "For the first time in our history, America's crime problem is being controlled by worldwide drug syndicates who operate their networks from places like Cali, Colombia \* \* \*."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am in complete agreement with my colleague from Georgia, that we are at a crucial point in our war on drugs. Without the immediate commitment of resources to stop the flow of illegal narcotics across our borders, the United States will be facing the largest expansion of illicit drug supplies and the greatest increase in drug use in modern American history.

Mr. COVERDELL. The chairman has clearly summarized the problem that the Senate attempted to address by increasing funding for international drug control in the foreign operations appropriations bill. I know the chairman shares my concern that the conference report before us today severely undermines the Senate's commitment to drug interdiction by decreasing the direct funding from \$150 to \$115 million and replacing the \$20 million mandatory transfer of funds with language merely allowing the transfer of funds from "Development Assistance" and/or the "Economic Support Fund" to "International Narcotics Control."

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Georgia is correct. It is my understanding, however, that the conference committee fully intended that the identified \$20 million be transferred to International Narcotics Control.

Mr. COVERDELL. I appreciate the chairman's clarification and would ask if the chairman would be willing to assist the Senator from Georgia in securing these resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my colleague, that I strongly support the transfer of the funds, identified in the conference report, to International Narcotics Control for drug interdiction

activities and will work side-by-side with the Senator from Georgia to ensure these resources are committed to our war on drugs.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the chairman for his efforts to stop the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur in the House amendment with the Leahy-Kassebaum amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] is absent because of illness in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 561 Leg.]

#### YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Moynihan
Baucus	Glenn	Murray
Biden	Graham	Nunn
Bingaman	Harkin	Pell
Boxer	Hollings	Pryor
Brown	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Jeffords	Robb
Bumpers	Kassebaum	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Roth
Campbell	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Chafee	Kerry	Simon
Cohen	Kohl	Simpson
Conrad	Lautenberg	Snowe
Daschle	Leahy	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Stevens
Dorgan	Lieberman	Thomas
Exon	Mikulski	Wellstone
Feingold	Moseley-Braun	

#### NAYS—44

Abraham	Ford	Lott
Ashcroft	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	Mack
Bond	Gramm	McCain
Breaux	Grams	McConnell
Burns	Grassley	Murkowski
Coats	Gregg	Nickles
Cochran	Hatch	Pressler
Coverdell	Heflin	Santorum
Craig	Helms	Shelby
D'Amato	Hutchison	Smith
DeWine	Inhofe	Thompson
Dole	Johnston	Thurmond
Domenici	Kempthorne	Warner
Faircloth	Kyl	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Bradley	Hatfield
---------	----------

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished leader in the Chamber. And I just mention first that we have, so my colleagues will know—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will come to order, please.

Mr. LEAHY. So colleagues would know, we have passed the conference and sent one amendment back in disagreement.

Mr. DOLE. Let me thank the managers of the bill.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business until 6:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2492. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Speaker appoints the following Member as an additional conferee in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of title I of the House bill, and subtitles A-C of title of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. BROWN of California.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; that the House recedes from its disagreement to an amendment of the Senate and concurs therein with an amendment in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill, previously received from the House for the concurrence of the Senate, was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1114. An act to authorize minors who are under the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and who are under 18 years of age to load materials into balers and compactors that meet appropriate American National Standards Institute design safety standards; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

H.R. 436. An act to require the head of any Federal agency to differentiate between fats,

oils, and greases of animal, marine, or vegetable origin, and other oils and greases, in issuing certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measure was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 1372. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase the earnings limit, and for other purposes.

The following bill was ordered placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2492. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1373. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to minimize the regulatory burden on agricultural producers in the conservation of highly erodible land, wetland, and retired cropland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. KEMPTHORNE):

S. 1374. A bill to require adoption of a management plan for the Hells Canyon National Recreation Area that allows appropriate use of motorized and nonmotorized river craft in the recreation area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. KEMPTHORNE):

S. 1375. A bill to preserve and strengthen the foreign market development cooperator program of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. COATS):

S. 1376. A bill to terminate unnecessary and inequitable Federal corporate subsidies; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LUGAR:

S. 1377. A bill to provide authority for the assessment of cane sugar produced in the Everglades Agricultural Area of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr.